

# Exhibit A

de Reyes v. Waples - pending motions and matters					
ECF No	Date	Party	Description	Status	Proposed Action
438	2/18/2022	Joint	Request for a pretrial conference 02/25/2022	not addressed; order entered 2/23/2022 removing case from trial calendar	Parties propose that the Court set a trial date, a pretrial conference, and a hearing on the motions in limine (as described below)
437	2/17/2022	Plaintiffs	Request to use laptops and phones at trial	not addressed; order entered 2/23/2022 removing case from trial calendar	Plaintiffs renew their request and ask that the Court grant it. No objection from Defendants.
436	12/21/2021	Plaintiffs	Motion to appear Pro Hac Vice by Nicholas Michael DiCarlo	not addressed; order entered 2/23/2022 removing case from trial calendar	Plaintiffs renew their motion and ask that the Court grant it. No objection from Defendants.
435	12/21/2021	Plaintiffs	Motion to appear Pro Hac Vice by Adam Abelson	not addressed; order entered 2/23/2022 removing case from trial calendar	None. Mr. Abelson has since left private practice and is serving as a magistrate judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.
372	6/4/2021	Plaintiffs	Motion to Amend Rule 26 disclosures - exhibit list and witness list (ECF 312)	Opposition filed 6/21/21; ECF 391 Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 396; argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	Plaintiffs renew their motion and Parties request that the Court consider Plaintiffs' motion to amend Rule 26 pretrial disclosures with Defendants' objections to Plaintiffs' Rule 26 pretrial disclosures (ECF 317).
340	1/11/2021	Defendants	MIL Exclude Argument Questioning Whether Valid Interests for the Policy were in Place at the Time of the Policy's Adoption.	Opposition filed 6/4/21; ECF 364; Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 392; Argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	Parties jointly propose the following procedure: i. Within 30 days of the Court's order, either party may file a revised version of any motion in limine in light of the Fourth Circuit's decision. ii. Within 21 days thereafter, either party may file a revised opposition to any motion in limine (including motions in limine that have not been revised) in light of the Fourth Circuit's decision. iii. Within 14 days thereafter, either party may submit a revised reply in support of a motion in limine.
337	1/11/2021	Defendants	MIL to exclude evidence of damages	Opposition filed 6/4/21; ECF 363 Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 394; argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	
331	1/11/2021	Plaintiffs	Plaintiffs' 8 MILs: (1) to exclude evidence that (a) Ps failed to show that Ds' Policy is "artificial, arbitrary, and unreasonable"; (b) the "anti-harboring" statute precludes Ps from demonstrating robust causality; and (c) Ps failed to show a "robust causal connection" between Ds' Policy and its impact on Ps as Latinos; (2) Ds must establish witness's personal knowledge before eliciting testimony on the "business necessities" the Policy purportedly fulfills; (3) Ds must establish witness's personal knowledge before eliciting testimony on 2009 and 2018 Treasury Inspector General reports; (4) to exclude evidence on the "anti-harboring" statute and the Personal Responsibility & Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act; (5) to exclude additional testimony regarding the Ps' legal immigration status beyond what is necessary to establish whether they are legally present; (6) to exclude evidence re Ds' views on immigrants or immigration; (7) to exclude evidence re Ds' possession of Fair Housing Act Training; (8) to exclude evidence re Ds' advertising in Spanish.	Opposition filed 6/4/21; ECF 379; Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 402; argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	
328	1/11/2021	Defendants	MIL Exclude Evidence of Lease Materials and Purported "Eviction" Correspondence	Opposition filed 6/4/21; ECF 362 Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 407; argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	
325	1/11/2021	Defendants	MIL to exclude expert testimony of Ivan Yacub, an immigration attorney, regarding (1) Individual Taxpayer Identification Numbers ("ITINs"), specifically how to obtain them, and (2) whether U.S. Visas and I-94 documents were good evidence of legal presence	Opposition filed 6/4/21; ECF 361 Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 401 argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	
322	1/11/2021	Defendants	MIL to exclude evidence of a "surname analysis" allegedly performed by Plaintiffs' former counsel, Mr. Archith Ramkumar. Dkt. 157-9 ("Ramkumar Declaration")	Opposition filed 6/4/21; ECF 360 Reply Brief filed 6/28/21; ECF 395 argued 07/16/2021; taken under advisement (ECF 412)	
321	12/23/2020	Defendants	Objections to Plaintiffs' trial exhibits	not addressed	Parties request that the Court consider their respective objections to each other's trial exhibits
320	12/23/2020	Plaintiffs	Objections to Defendants' trial exhibits	not addressed	
318	12/18/2020	Plaintiffs	Objections to Defendants' deposition designations	not addressed	Plaintiff requests that the Court consider their objections to the Defendants' deposition designations and that any issues related thereto be resolved during a final pretrial conference set by the court.
317	12/18/2020	Defendants	Objections to Plaintiffs' Rule 26 pretrial disclosures (ECF 312) and request to strike witnesses called to establish foundation for records or other evidence if witness not listed in pretrial disclosures	not addressed; related to ECF 372 (Plaintiffs' motion to amend Rule 26 pre-trial disclosures)	Parties request that the Court consider Defendants' objections together with Plaintiffs' motion to amend Rule 26 pre-trial disclosures (ECF 372).